DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 990 UD 028 618

AUTHOR Chamberlain, Ed
TITLE Home School and Adult Instruction Component Home-School-Community Agents Project 1990-91. Final Evaluation Report. Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 60p.; For the 1989-90 report, see ED 330 739.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; Behavior Problems; *Change Agents; *Dropout Prevention; Dropout Programs; Educational Objectives; High Risk Students; *High School Students; Intermediate Grades; *Junior High School Students; Middle Schools; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Secondary Education; *Student Attitudes; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Columbus Public Schools OH; Disruptive Behavior; *Home School Community Systems

ABSTRACT

The Home-School-Community Agent (HSCA) Project of the Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools was established in the 1990-91 school year to help disruptive students make a positive adjustment to elements in their lives that interfere with success in school. The project was implemented through 21 HSCAs in nine high schools and 12 middle schools. Each agent worked with approximately 60 students and designated 20 students for inclusion in the evaluation sample. Program objectives called for demonstrated improvement in attitudes toward teachers, education, and school behavior for 50 percent of the students. These attitudes were measured through the Demos D Scale and other determinants of student attitudes and background completed by students and teachers. Complete pretest-posttest Demos D data were obtained for 241 of the initial 420. Just over 15 percent had a lower probability of dropping out after the project, while almost 13 percent had an increased dropout risk. Some positive change in attitude was demonstrated by 46.1 percent through the Demos D Scale, and agents indicated that 72.4 percent showed behavior improvement. The project was considered valuable by students, agents, and school staff; and an administrative decision was made to continue it in the 1991-92 school year. Sixteen tables and one figure present study findings. One reference is listed, and appendices present dropout probabilities by grade in seven tables and study instruments. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343990

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

1990-91

Written by:

Ed Chamberlain
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Computer Analysis by:

Kathy Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Thompson
Columbus Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD 028 618

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT
1990-91

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The primary purpose of the Home-School-Community Agent (HSCA) Project is to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. As defined by the HSCA project, "disruptive" refers to any action or behavior which interrupts the educational process in or out of school.

Time Interval: The HSCA project started on August 29, 1990 and continued through the 1990-91 school year. Implementation of the project was accomplished by 21 Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) who served in nine high schools and 12 middle schools. Two HSCA positions were funded by the school system's general fund, but Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF) guidelines were followed in all units.

Activities: Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils who had been identified as disruptive. Each HSCA was asked to designate 20 of these pupils for inclusion in the evaluation sample. In addition to direct contact with project pupils, the HSCA served as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to assist pupils in their adjustment to the school environment.

Program Objective: Of the selected pupils served by the HSCA, 50% of the pupils will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior and will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements of the pupils' lives which interfere with their success in school. The HSCA will serve as a liaison to the home, school, and community to promote understanding and provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for the HSCA Project called for the collection of data using the Demos D Scale (provides a measure of pupil attitudes in four areas, and also predicts the probability of dropping out of school), Pupil Entry Information Sheet (provides individual pupil data on those elements obstructing pupil achievement), Pupil Census Form (provides pupil information and HSCAs' ratings of pupil progress), Pupil Questionnaire (provides pupils' perceptions regarding the HSCAs' activities), Professional Staff Survey (provides school staff perceptions regarding the role of the HSCA), and the HSCA Log Sheet (provides documentation of HSCAs' activities).

Major Findings: Complete pretest-posttest data on the Demos D Scale (DDS) were collected for 241 (57.4%) of the 420 pupils in the evaluation sample. Of the 241 pupils in the testing sample, 37 pupils (15.4%) had a lower probability of dropping out, while 31 pupils (12.9%) had a higher probability of dropping out at the end of the treatment period. Of the 241 pupils tested, 111 (46.1%) demonstrated some positive change in their attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. This did not meet the project criterion of improvement in attitudes by 50% of project pupils.

Pupils in grade 9 demonstrated statistically significant improvement on two scales: attitude toward teachers, and total score. Statistically significant change in the wrong direction was found in attitude toward teachers at grade 6, and in attitude toward school behavior at grade 10. Improvement in attitudes

toward teachers was found in grades 8 and 9. Improvement in attitudes toward education was found in grades 8 and 9, and for the total group. Improvement regarding influence by peers or parents occurred in grades 7 and 9. Improvement of attitudes toward school behavior occurred in grades 8, 9, and 11. Improvements in terms of the total score occurred in grades 8 and 9, and for the total group. According to the dropout probabilities provided by the test publisher, the pupils in the evaluation sample had, on the average, approximately a 50% chance of dropping out before and after their involvement in the project.

A pupil may be referred to the HSCA program for one or more reasons. Of the 420 pupils in the evaluation sample, 88 (21.0%) were referred for a single reason, and 100 (23.8%) were referred for two reasons. Three or more reasons were given for referral for 232 (55.2%) of the pupils in the sample. The four most frequent referral reasons in the overall program (N=420) were disruptiveness (185 pupils or 44.0%), teacher conflict (173 pupils or 41.2%), poor attitude (154 pupils or 36.7%), and poor grades (152 pupils or 36.2%). In middle school (n=240) the four most frequent referral reasons were disruptiveness (127 pupils or 52.9%), poor attitude (97 pupils or 40.4%), teacher conflict (94 pupils or 39.2%), and poor grades (80 pupils or 33.3%). The four most frequent referral reasons in high school (n=180) were hostility to authority (86 pupils or 47.8%), teacher conflict (79 pupils or 43.9%), poor grades (72 pupils or 40.0%), and class cutting (71 pupils or 39.4%.

The HSCAs indicated that 304 (72.4%) of the 420 pupils in the evaluation sample showed evidence of improvement in relation to their original referral reasons, 275 (65.5%) showed academic improvement, and 312 (74.3%) improved socially. Among the 293 pupils responding to the Pupil Questionnaire, pupils reported that they were getting along better with their teachers (73.4%), families (36.5%), and friends (39.2%) since talking with the HSCA. Of the 127 administrators and teachers who responded to the Professional Staff Survey, 105 (84.7%) reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance.

Analysis of the HSCA Log Sheet indicated that the average HSCA's week included 41.2 sessions involving individual or group guidance for a total of 11.8 hours; 36.0 liaison activities involving parents, school personnel, and/or community agencies for a total of 10.8 hours; and 10.8 hours served in various school support activities. Analysis of the Professional Staff Survey indicted that 126 (99.2%) of the 127 respondents viewed the HSCA role of home-school-community liaison to be important.

Three inservice meetings were provided for the HSCAs by the Department of Pupil Personnel. All three meetings were rated by more than 80% of the participants as providing information that would assist them in their duties.

The data collected for the Home-School-Community Agents project presented mixed findings. Although the project was considered valuable by pupils, HSCAs, and school staff, improvement of pupil attitudes as measured by the Demos D Scale was less than desired. An administrative decision has already been made to continue the project in the 1991-92 school year under the school system's general fund. Under the reorganized program HSCAs will work closely with Safety and Security personnel and the program will be expanded to provide services to more high schools and middle schools. State of Ohio DPPF funds previously used for the HSCA program will be reallocated to other DPPF-funded programs. It is recommended for the restructured program that: (1) In-depth work with disruptive pupils continue as an integral part of the program; and (2) The HSCA's time be freed from a number of building level duties in order to concentrate on activities more directly related to program goals.

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT
1990-91

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The primary purpose of the Home-School-Community Agent (HSCA) Project is to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. As defined by the HSCA project, "disruptive" refers to any action or behavior which interrupts the educational process in or out of school.

Time Interval: The HSCA project started on August 29, 1990 and continued through the 1990-91 school year. Implementation of the project was accomplished by 21 Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) who served in nine high schools and 12 middle schools. Two HSCA positions were funded by the school system's general fund, but Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF) guidelines were followed in all units.

Activities: Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils who had been identified as disruptive. Each HSCA was asked to designate 20 of these pupils for inclusion in the evaluation sample. In addition to direct contact with project pupils, the HSCA served as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to assist pupils in their adjustment to the school environment.

Program Objective: Of the selected pupils served by the HSCA, 50% of the pupils will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior and will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements of the pupils' lives which interfere with their success in school. The HSCA will serve as a liaison to the home, school, and community to promote understanding and provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for the HSCA Project called for the collection of data using the Demos D Scale (provides a measure of pupil attitudes in four areas, and also predicts the probability of dropping out of school), Pupil Entry Information Sheet (provides individual pupil data on those elements obstructing pupil achievement), Pupil Census Form (provides pupil information and HSCAs' ratings of pupil progress), Pupil Questionnaire (provides pupils' perceptions regarding the HSCAs' activities), Professional Staff Survey (provides school staff perceptions regarding the role of the HSCA), and the HSCA Log Sheet (provides documentation of HSCAs' activities).

Major Findings: Complete pretest-posttest data on the Demos D Scale (DDS) were collected for 241 (57.4%) of the 420 pupils in the evaluation sample. Of the 241 pupils in the testing sample, 37 pupils (15.4%) had a lower probability of dropping out, while 31 pupils (12.9%) had a higher probability of dropping out at the end of the treatment period. Of the 241 pupils tested, 111 (46.1%) demonstrated some positive change in their attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. This did not meet the project criterion of improvement in attitudes by 50% of project pupils.

Pupils in grade 9 demonstrated statistically significant improvement on two scales: attitude toward teachers, and total score. Statistically significant change in the wrong direction was found in attitude toward teachers at grade 6, and in attitude toward school behavior at grade 10. Improvement in attitudes

toward teachers was found in grades 8 and 9. Improvement in attitudes toward education was found in grades 8 and 9, and for the total group. Improvement regarding influence by peers or parents occurred in grades 7 and 9. Improvement of attitudes toward school behavior occurred in grades 8, 9, and 11. Improvements in terms of the total score occurred in grades 8 and 9, and for the total group. According to the dropout probabilities provided by the test publisher, the pupils in the evaluation sample had, on the average, approximately a 50% chance of dropping out before and after their involvement in the project.

A pupil may be referred to the HSCA program for one or more reasons. Of the 420 pupils in the evaluation sample, 88 (21.0%) were referred for a single reason, and 100 (23.8%) were referred for two reasons. Three or more reasons were given for referral for 232 (55.2%) of the pupils in the sample. The four most frequent referral reasons in the overall program (N=420) were disruptiveness (185 pupils or 44.0%), teacher conflict (173 pupils or 41.2%), poor attitude (154 pupils or 36.7%), and poor grades (152 pupils or 36.2%). In middle school (n=240) the four most frequent referral reasons were disruptiveness (127 pupils or 52.9%), poor attitude (97 pupils or 40.4%), teacher conflict (94 pupils or 39.2%), and poor grades (80 pupils or 33.3%). The four most frequent referral reasons in high school (n=180) were hostility to authority (86 pupils or 47.8%), teacher conflict (79 pupils or 43.9%), poor grades (72 pupils or 40.0%), and class cutting (71 pupils or 39.4%.

The HSCAs indicated that 304 (72.4%) of the 420 pupils in the evaluation sample showed evidence of improvement in relation to their original referral reasons, 275 (65.5%) showed academic improvement, and 312 (74.3%) improved socially. Among the 293 pupils responding to the Pupil Questionnaire, pupils reported that they were getting along better with their teachers (73.4%), families (36.5%), and friends (39.2%) since talking with the HSCA. Of the 127 administrators and teachers who responded to the Professional Staff Survey, 105 (84.7%) reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance.

Analysis of the HSCA Log Sheet indicated that the average HSCA's week included 41.2 sessions involving individual or group guidance for a total of 11.8 hours; 36.0 liaison activities involving parents, school personnel, and/or community agencies for a total of 10.8 hours; and 10.8 hours served in various school support activities. Analysis of the Professional Staff Survey indicted that 126 (99.2%) of the 127 respondents viewed the HSCA role of home-school-community liaison to be important.

Three inservice meetings were provided for the HSCAs by the Department of Pupil Personnel. All three meetings were rated by more than 80% of the participants as providing information that would assist them in their duties.

The data collected for the Home-School-Community Agents project presented mixed findings. Although the project was considered valuable by pupils, HSCAs, and school staff, improvement of pupil attitudes as measured by the Demos D Scale was less than desired. An administrative decision has already been made to continue the project in the 1991-92 school year under the school system's general fund. Under the reorganized program HSCAs will work closely with Safety and Security personnel and the program will be expanded to provide services to more high schools and middle schools. State of Ohio DPPF funds previously used for the HSCA program will be reallocated to other DPPF-funded programs. It is recommended for the restructured program that: (1) In-depth work with disruptive pupils continue as an integral part of the program; and (2) The HSCA's time be freed from a number of building level duties in order to concentrate on activities more directly related to program goals.

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

1990-91

Program Description

The Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) project has been operating in the Columbus Public Schools since the 1968-69 school year. This program was funded by the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF). The overall goal is to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. As defined by the HSCA project, "disruptive" refers to any action or behavior which interrupts the educational process of the pupil in or out of the school.

To reach the 1990-91 project goal, 21 Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) served 9 high schools and 12 middle schools. Two general fund HSCAs were included in this census, one serving in a high school and the other serving in a middle school. The two general fund program units represented an expansion of the HSCA program but were funded from the Columbus Public Schools' general fund rather than DPPF. However, the guidelines for the two general fund units were the same as for the 19 DPPF-funded units and the data for these two units are subsumed in the report for the overall program. The schools served by the program are listed below:

High Schools	Middle Schools	
Centennial	Barrett	Linmoor
Briggs	Beery	Medina
Brookhaven	Crestview	Mohawk
East	Eastmoor	Starling
Linden McKinley	Everett	Wedgewood
South	Indianola	Westmoor
Walnut Ridge		
West		
Whetstone		

Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils who had been identified as disruptive. Each HSCA was asked to designate 20 of these pupils for inclusion in the evaluation sample. In addition to direct contact with project pupils, the HSCA served as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to assist pupils in their adjustment to the school environment.

Evaluation Objectives

Objective 1.0 Of the selected pupils who are served by the HSCA for the treatment period, 50% of the pupils will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior.

Objective 2.0 At the culmination of the agent-pupil sessions, 50% of the selected pupils will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements of the pupils' lives which interfere with their success in school.

Criterion 2.1 Identification of "disruptive" elements and/or pupil concerns which appear to be obstructing pupil achievement.

Criterion 2.2 Evidence of positive adjustments of at least 50% of selected pupils.

Objective 3.0 To serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment.

Criterion 3.1 80% of the pupils served will perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance for the adjustment to the school environment.

Criterion 3.2 80% of the professional staff who referred pupils to the HSCA will perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance to pupils to the school environment.

Objective 4.0 To provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants will rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design for the HSCA Project called for the collection of data in seven areas. Except for the Demos D Scale a copy of each instrument used in the evaluation is found in Appendix B.

1. Pupil Attitude Information

The Demos D Scale (DDS; Demos, 1970) provides a measure of pupil attitudes and the probability of dropping out of school. The pretest was given during the period of October 16-26, 1990 and the posttest was given in the period of April 15-26, 1991.

The DDS is composed of 29 items that yield four Basic Area Scores and a Total Score. Pupils are asked to rate each item on a 5-point scale that, except for one item, ranges from "nearly always" to "nearly never". Higher scores indicate a poorer attitude and a higher probability of dropping out of school. The four Basic Area Scores and Total Score are as follows:

T (Teachers): Deals with attitudes toward teachers, counselors, and administrators. This area is comprised of 10 items with scores ranging from 10-50.

E (Education): Deals with attitudes toward education, training, and college. This area is comprised of nine items with scores ranging from 9-45.

P (Peers): Deals with attitudes toward peers and parents. This area is comprised of five items with scores ranging from 5-25.

S (School): Deals with attitudes toward school behavior. This area is comprised of five items with scores ranging from 5-25.

Total Score: The text publisher indicates that, based on the results of clinical experience, this is the best predictor of dropping out of school. Scores range from 29-145.

The test publisher cites six uses for the DDS. First, it provides an objective method for obtaining expressions of attitudes related to dropping out of school. The DDS is of special help in working with junior and senior high school students. Second, it identifies students with strongly negative attitudes toward teachers and school, so preventive or corrective work can take place while students still are in school. Third, the instrument can make it possible to alert parents of children who indicate that they may drop out of school. Fourth, data can be provided about students to facilitate the counseling or psychotherapy of problem children. Fifth, data can be used to structure or develop school programs for identifying and working with potential dropouts so schools can be of help in reducing dropouts. Sixth, the instrument can provide a research approach in areas such as dropping out of school, adjusting to school, attitude formation, effective learning, etc.

2. Pupil Entry Information

The Pupil Entry Information Sheet (see Appendix B, page 35) provided individual pupil data on those elements obstructing pupil achievement which formed the basis for assigning pupils to the project. It also identified the person referring the pupil to the project. It was completed by the HSCAs and collected in October 1990.

3. Pupil Census Information

HSCAs completed a Pupil Census Form (see Appendix B, page 36) for each pupil in the evaluation sample. These forms were collected in April 1991. Pupil Census Forms provided individual data on nine items: pupil involvement with the court, number of months in the project, number of contacts with the pupil, number of in-school conferences with the pupil, number of home visits made regarding the pupil, pupil referral to a community agency, and assessment of the pupils' adjustment in three areas: academic improvement, social progress, and final outcome regarding original referral reasons.

4. Pupil Questionnaire Information

The Pupil Questionnaire was used to survey pupils in the evaluation sample to determine their perceptions of the HSCA's role in providing adjustment to the home-school-community environment, and to provide evidence of pupils' adjustment to school. The instrument was administered in February 1991. See Appendix B, page 37, for a copy of the Pupil Questionnaire.

5. Professional Staff Survey Information

The Professional Staff Survey was designed to determine perceptions of school professional staff regarding the HSCA role as a liaison between

the school and the home and community. It was administered in February 1991 to those members of school professional staffs who had referred pupils for inclusion in the HSCA Project, as determined from the Pupil Entry Information Sheet. A copy of the Professional Staff Survey is found on page 38, Appendix B.

6. HSCA Log Information

The purpose of the HSCA Weekly Log Sheet (see Appendix B, pages 39-42) was to provide documentation of a Home-School-Community Agent's activities in a selected week. The original evaluation design called for each HSCA to complete the HSCA log for two randomly selected weeks. However the data base for this instrument was expanded such that each HSCA completed the instrument on a monthly basis for the period from November 5, 1990 through March 29, 1991, a period of 18.2 school weeks. It was felt that this provided a more representative basis for computing HSCA activities in a typical week. Monthly updates of HSCA Log analysis were also provided to program administrators.

7. Inservice Evaluation Information

The General Inservice Evaluation Form was used to document the inservice meetings held and obtain the ratings by HSCAs regarding the value of the inservice that was provided. A modified version of the form was used for the orientation meeting of October 1, 1990. Ratings were obtained in the following areas: how worthwhile the meeting was, usefulness of the information presented, time available to ask questions, and how adequately questions were answered. The rating scale used was (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. The General Inservice Evaluation Form and the modified version used in the orientation meeting are both found in Appendix B, pages 43-45. Dates and topics of HSCA inservice meetings were as follows:

Date	Topic
October 1, 1990	Teen Pregnancy, followed by Program Orientation for the 1990-91 School Year
November 12, 1990	Occult Worship
December 3, 1990	Stress Management

Major Findings

The evaluation sample consisted of 420 pupils who were randomly selected from the 1,260 pupils served by the project. The grade and sex of evaluation sample pupils are presented in Table 1. The sample was comprised of 164 girls and 256 boys.

Table 1

Grade and Sex of Pupils
in the Evaluation Sample

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys
6	66	25	41
7	80	34	46
8	94	45	49
9	88	28	60
10	52	20	32
11	25	8	17
12	15	4	11
Total	420	164	256

Objective 1.0 required that 50% of the group of selected pupils who were served by the HSCA for the entire treatment period would show improvement in their attitude toward the school environment. The pupils were pretested during the period of October 16-26, 1990 and posttested during the period of April 15-26, 1991 with the Demos D Scale (DDS). The DDS yields four Basic Area Scores and a Total Score which provide data to be compared with the standardization group. The interpretation of DDS scores is as follows: the higher the score the greater the probability of dropping out of school. If it can be assumed that pupils with a high probability of dropping out of school have a poor attitude about teachers and school behavior, a lower posttest score on the DDS should be one indication of a "positive" change in attitude. The test publisher states that the DDS may be used to identify pupils with strongly negative attitudes toward teachers and school but cautions that DDS scores be used with all other available information concerning the pupil. It is not advisable that DDS scores by themselves be used for definitive diagnostic purposes.

Matched pretest-posttest total scores for the DDS were collected for 241 (57.4%) of the 420 pupils in the evaluation sample. Of these pupils, 111 (46.1%) demonstrated a positive change in their attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. Thus the Objective (1.0) of 50% was not attained.

Table 2 contains descriptive data regarding the pretest-posttest DDS Basic Area Scores and Total Score reported by grade level. Improvement in attitudes toward teachers was found in grades 8 and 9. Improvement in attitude toward education was found in grades 8 and 9, and in the total average across grades. Improvement in influence by peers and parents occurred in grades 7 and 9. Improvement in attitudes toward school behavior occurred in grades 6, 8, 9, and 11. Improvement in terms of total score occurred in grades 8 and 9, and in the total average across grades. In grade 9 there was improvement of average scores in all four Demos D subtests and in the total score. In grade 8 there was improvement in all scales except for the scale on influence by peers and parents. Grades 10 and 12, on the other hand, showed no improvement on any subtest in regard to average scores. Application of *t*-tests indicated significant differences at three grade levels. In grade six there was a significant difference reflecting a negative change in attitude toward teachers, significant at the .05 level. Significant improvement was indicated

Table 2

Pretest, Posttest and Change Means for Demos D Scale (DDS)
Basic Area Scores and Total Score Reported By Grade
Level for HSCA Evaluation Sample
1990-91

Grade Level		T Attitudes Towards Teachers	E Attitudes Toward Education	P Influence by Peers and Parents	S Attitudes Toward School Behavior	Total Score
6	Number of Pupils	32	32	32	32	32
	Pretest Mean	24.2	17.1	11.9	11.6	64.8
	Posttest Mean	26.2	17.5	12.9	11.1	67.7
	Change in Mean	2.0*	0.4	1.0	- 0.5	2.8
7	Number of Pupils	50	50	50	50	50
	Pretest Mean	24.2	15.4	11.9	11.0	62.6
	Postteset Mean	25.6	16.2	11.8	11.6	65.2
	Change in Mean	1.5	0.7	- 0.1	0.5	2.6
8	Number of Pupils	45	46	46	46	45
	Pretest Mean	26.5	16.6	11.6	11.1	65.8
	Posttest Mean	25.5	15.1	11.6	11.0	62.8
	Change in Mean	- 1.0	- 1.5	0.0	- 0.1	- 2.9
9	Number of Pupils	53	53	53	53	53
	Pretest Mean	28.3	20.1	11.9	12.5	72.7
	Posttest Mean	25.5	17.9	11.1	11.7	66.2
	Change in Mean	- 2.9**	- 2.0	- 0.9	- 0.7	- 6.5*
10	Number of Pupils	33	33	33	33	33
	Pretest Mean	26.1	16.0	10.7	10.4	63.1
	Posttest Mean	27.3	17.2	11.0	11.6	67.1
	Change in Mean	1.2	1.2	0.4	1.2*	4.0
11	Number of Pupils	17	17	17	17	17
	Pretest Mean	27.1	15.9	10.4	11.0	64.4
	Posttest Mean	27.7	17.2	10.4	10.5	65.8
	Change in Mean	0.6	1.4	0.1	- 0.5	1.5
12	Number of Pupils	11	11	11	11	11
	Pretest Mean	24.0	14.3	9.5	9.4	57.1
	Posttest Mean	25.4	15.4	10.8	10.0	61.5
	Change in Mean	1.4	1.1	1.4	0.6	4.5
Total	Number of Pupils	241	242	242	242	241
	Pretest Mean	26.0	16.9	11.5	11.3	65.6
	Posttest Mean	26.0	16.7	11.5	11.3	65.4
	Change in Mean	0.0	- 0.2	0.0	0.0	- 0.2

Note. A negative change indicates improvement.

Note. In some cases, the "Change in Mean" may appear to be a tenth of a point off from the apparent difference between pretest and posttest means. This is due to rounding error. All mean scores (pretest, posttest and change) were rounded to the nearest tenth in this table.

*p <.05
**p <.01

at grade 9 in attitude toward teachers at the .01 level, and in the total score at the .05 level. In grade 10 there was a significant difference reflecting a negative change in attitude toward school behavior (at the .05 level). According to the dropout probabilities provided by the test publisher, the pupils in the evaluation sample had, on the average, approximately a 50% chance of dropping out before and after their involvement in the project. The probabilities are expressed as the chance of dropping out per 100 pupils. The data in Figure 1 show that of the 241 pupils in the Demos D evaluation sample, 37 pupils (15.4%) had a lower probability of dropping out, and 31 pupils (12.9%) had a higher probability of dropping out at the end of the treatment period. This same information is reported by grade level in Appendix A, pages 26-33.

Objective 2.0 required that 50% of the selected pupils demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives which interfere with their success in school. Criterion 2.1 required the identification of those elements obstructing pupil achievement. The Pupil Entry Information Sheet was used to collect data on Criterion 2.1. Criterion 2.2 required evidence of positive adjustment of at least 50% of the selected pupils. Data for Criterion 2.2, as well as additional data, were collected using the Pupil Census Forms.

The Pupil Entry Information Sheet provided data on who referred pupils and why they were referred to the HSCA. Table 3, page 9, contains a ranking of the referral reasons by frequency and percent for each school level. The frequencies and percents in this table are not additive since a pupil could be referred for more than one reason.

The four most frequent referral reasons in the overall program (N=420) were disruptiveness (44.0%), teacher conflict (41.2%), poor attitude (36.7%), and poor grades (36.2%). In middle school (N=240) the four most frequent referral reasons were disruptiveness (52.9%), poor attitude (40.4%), teacher conflict (39.2%), and poor grades (33.3%). The four most frequent referral reasons in high school (N=180) were hostility to authority (47.8%), teacher conflict (43.9%), poor grades (40.0%), and class cutting (39.4%).

As has been indicated, a pupil may be referred to the HSCA program for one or more of the reasons indicated in Table 3. Table 4 summarizes the number of reasons for which individual students were referred. Of the 420 pupils in the sample, 88 (21.0%) were referred for a single reason, 100 (23.8%) were referred for two reasons, and 232 pupils (55.2%) were referred for three or more reasons.

The first criterion for Objective 2.0 was met. As indicated from the data above, the Pupil Entry Information Sheet served to identify the problem areas appearing to obstruct the achievement of individual pupils. Data regarding positive adjustment to the problem areas, as well as additional data, were collected using the Pupil Census Forms. Pupil Census Form data were collected for all 420 pupils in the original evaluation sample.

The Pupil Census Forms provided individual data on pupil involvement with the court. Analysis of these data indicated that 180 (42.9%) of the 420 pupils in the Pupil Census Form sample had been involved with the court.

Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	Posttest Dropout Probability Categories: 5	25	50	70	90	Total
5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
25	0 0.0	1 0.4	2 0.8	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 1.2
50	0 0.0	3 1.2	163 67.6	19 7.9	5 2.1	190 78.8
70	0 0.0	0 0.0	19 7.9	6 2.5	5 2.1	30 12.4
90	0 0.0	0 0.0	14 5.8	1 0.4	3 1.2	18 7.5
Total	0 0.0	4 1.7	198 82.2	26 10.8	13 5.4	241 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 1. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on Demos D Total Score Across Grades

Table 3

Frequency and Ranking of Reasons for Referral to HSCA Program by School Level

	Total Component (Grades 6-12) n=420			Middle School (Grades 6-8) n=240			High School (Grades 9-12) n=180		
Referral Reason	Rank	Frequency	%	Rank	Frequency	%	Rank	Frequency	%
Disruptive	1	185	44.0	1	127	52.9	6	58	32.2
Teacher Conflict	2	173	41.2	3	94	39.2	2	79	43.9
Poor Attitude	3	154	36.7	2	97	40.4	7	57	31.7
Poor Grades	4	152	36.2	4	80	33.3	3	72	40.0
Hostile to Authority	5	142	33.8	8	56	23.3	1	86	47.8
Attendance Problem	6	134	31.9	6.5	70	29.2	5	64	35.6
Peer Conflict	7	129	30.7	5	74	30.8	8	55	30.6
Family/Home Problem	8	118	28.1	6.5	70	29.2	9	48	26.7
Class Cutting	9	108	25.7	10	37	15.4	4	71	39.4
Truancy	10	72	17.1	9	40	16.7	10	32	17.8
Law-Court Conflict	11	62	14.8	11	31	12.9	11	31	17.2
Drugs/Alcohol	12	23	5.5	12	12	5.0	12	11	6.1
Other	13	14	3.3	13	11	4.6	13.5	3	1.7
Health Problem	14	8	1.9	14	5	2.1	13.5	3	1.7

Table 4

Frequency and Percent of Number of Reasons for Pupil Referrals to the HSCA Program

Number of Reasons for Referral	Frequency	Percent
1	88	21.0
2	100	23.8
3	69	16.4
4	46	11.0
5	36	8.6
6	26	6.2
7	20	4.8
8	9	2.1
9	17	4.0
10	6	1.4
11	2	0.5
12	1	0.2
Total	420	100.0

Table 5 presents the number of months pupils were served by the project. These data include any service received previous to the present school year. A majority of pupils in the evaluation sample (286) had been served by the project for 6 to 10 months. An additional 55 were served for 11 months or more. Thus, a considerable proportion of the pupils have been served by the project for one or more years.

Table 5

Number and Percent of Pupils by Months of HSCA Service

Number of Months	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils
1-5	79	18.8
6-10	286	68.1
11-15	32	7.6
16-20	17	4.0
21-25	2	0.5
More than 25	4	1.0
Total	420	100.0

HSCAs were asked to indicate the number of contacts made with each pupil. Analysis of these data indicates that 312 (74.3%) of the pupils in the evaluation sample were seen seven or more times. The number of pupils who were seen eleven or more times was 218, or 51.9%. Therefore a large portion of the HSCA's time is spent in conferences. HSCAs indicated that four or more in-school conferences were held regarding 272 (64.8%) of the pupils in the evaluation sample. In addition, four or more home visits were made involving 131 (31.2%) of the pupils. The data relating to pupil contacts are contained in Table 6. An additional type of contact HSCAs made on behalf of pupils was referral to community agencies. HSCAs indicated that they had made such referrals for 206 (49.0%) of their pupils.

Table 6

Frequency of HSCA Contacts, In-school Conferences, and Home Visits with Each Pupil
N=420

	Number of Contacts					
	None	1-3	4-6	7-10	11 or More	No Response
Contacts with the pupil	0	38	70	94	218	0
In school conferences held regarding this pupil	17	131	108	67	97	0
Home visits made regarding this pupil	52	237	99	14	18	0

HSCAs also rated each pupil's final outcome in relation to academic improvement, progress in social adjustment, and the original reasons for the pupil's referral. The following change categories were used: Marked Improvement, Improvement, or No Improvement. The final outcome ratings of the 420 pupils in the evaluation sample are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Number and Percent of Pupils on Three Outcome Measures by Degree of Improvement

	Academic Improvement		Social Adjustment		Referral Reasons	
Change	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils
Marked Improvement	46	11.0	65	15.5	77	18.3
Improvement	229	54.5	247	58.8	227	54.0
No Improvement	145	34.5	108	25.7	116	27.6
Total	420	100.0	420	100.0	420	100.0

The second criterion of Objective 2.0 required evidence of positive adjustment by at least 50% of the selected pupils. Table 7 shows that 304 (72.4%) of the pupils in the sample were rated as having derived some benefit ("Improvement" or "Marked Improvement") from the project in relation to their original Referral Reasons. In addition, 275 (65.5%) were rated as having improved academically, and 312 pupils (74.3%) were rated as having improved in their social adjustment. Both criteria for Objective 2.0 (identification of problem areas and improvement in the problem areas) were met. Thus, Objective 2.0 was achieved. The numbers and percents of pupils rated in the highest category, "Marked Improvement," were 77 (18.3%) for Referral Reasons, 46 (11.0%) for academic improvement, and 65 (15.5%) for social adjustment. These are encouraging results for pupils who are in the project because of disruptive influences.

Objective 3.0 was to serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment. It had two criteria. Criterion 3.1 required that 80% of the pupils served would perceive that the HSCA provided such understanding and assistance; it was assessed using the Pupil Questionnaire. Criterion 3.2, which required similar perceptions by 80% of professional staff members who referred pupils to the HSCA, was assessed using the Professional Staff Survey. A third instrument, the HSCA Log Sheet, documented the activities performed by the HSCA in attempting to meet the needs and goals of the pupils.

The pupils were surveyed during February 1991 with the locally constructed Pupil Questionnaire. The Pupil Questionnaire was designed to determine student perceptions of the HSCA role in promoting adjustment in the home-school-community environment and to provide data regarding the student's adjustment to school.

Of the 315 Pupil Questionnaires that were distributed, 293 (93.0%) were returned. In the following analysis, all percents are based on the number of pupils returning the survey. The results of the survey are summarized in Tables 8-12.

When asked which activities HSCAs had performed in order to help them, pupils indicated the following: "Took time to discuss my problems with me" (82.6%); "Visited my home" (50.5%); "Arranged meeting with my teacher(s)" (43.0%); and "Visited community agency on my behalf such as CMACAO, health center, or counseling agency" (15.7%) (see Table 8).

Data for survey items dealing with pupils' perceptions of the promotion of understanding by the HSCA are presented in Table 9. When asked if it was a good idea to talk over their school-related problems with the HSCA, 95.2% of the pupils responded "yes". A large majority (95.6%) of the pupils also agreed that the HSCA was understanding to talk with. When the pupils were asked if they thought they understood their own problems better since talking with the HSCA, 83.3% indicated that this was the case. The average percent of positive responses to the three items concerning promotion of understanding was 91.4%.

The survey items in Table 10 indicate pupil perceptions of assistance (helpfulness) provided by the HSCA. The percent of pupils who perceived that the HSCA was helpful to them was 92.2%; 95.2% of the pupils agreed that pupils with problems could get help from the HSCA.

Table 8

Frequency and Percent of Pupils Reporting
Benefit From Specific HSCA Activities
N=293

Which of the ways was used by the Home-School-Community Agent to help you.	Pupils Responding Yes	
	Frequency	Percent
Took time to discuss my problems with me	242	82.6
Visited my home	148	50.5
Arranged meeting(s) with teachers	126	43.0
Visited a community agency on my behalf such as CMACAO, Health Center, or counseling agency	46	15.7

Table 9

Frequency and Percent of Pupils
Perceiving the HSCAs' Promotion of Understanding
N=293

Item	Pupil Response					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
When a student has trouble in school or with a teacher, it is a good idea to talk it over with the Home-School-Community Agent.	279	95.2	13	4.4	1	0.3
The Home-School-Community Agent is an understanding person to talk with.	280	95.6	12	4.1	1	0.3
I think I understand my own problems better since talking with Home-School-Community Agent.	244	83.3	47	16.0	2	0.7

Table 11 presents pupil's perceptions of their adjustment to school since their entry into the HSCA program. Improved classroom attendance was indicated by 67.6% of the pupils, while 72.0% of the pupils indicated improvement in keeping up with their assignments.

Additional evidence of pupil adjustment (to teachers, family, and friends) can be found in Table 12. Pupils indicated that, since talking to the Home-School-Community Agent, 73.4% were getting along better with their teachers, 36.5% were getting along better with their families, and 39.2% were getting along better with their friends.

Table 10

Frequency and Percent of Pupils' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of the HSCA
N=293

Item	Pupil Response					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
The Home-School-Community Agent was helpful to me	270	92.2	17	5.8	6	2.0
Pupils with problems can get help from the Home-School-Community-Agent.	279	95.2	10	3.4	4	1.4

Table 11

Frequency and Percent of Pupils Reporting Adjustment to School
N=293

Item	Pupil Response					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
I feel my classroom attendance has improved since meeting with the Home-School-Community Agent	198	67.6	85	29.0	10	3.4
I am keeping up with my assignments better since working with the Home-School-Community Agent.	211	72.0	75	25.6	7	2.4

Table 12

Frequency and Percent of Pupils' Perceived Improvement in Getting Along with Others
N=293

Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with	Pupils Responding Yes	
	Frequency	Percent
My teachers	215	73.4
My family	107	36.5
My friends	115	39.2

Criterion 3.1 required that 80% of the pupils served would perceive the HSCA as promoting understanding and providing assistance for the adjustment to the school environment. The Pupil Questionnaire data cited above indicate that this criterion to objective 3.0 was attained. Well over 80% of the pupils perceived the HSCA as promoting understanding (see Table 9), and well over 80% also perceived the HSCA as providing assistance (see Table 10).

The professional staff members were surveyed in February 1991 with the locally constructed Professional Staff Survey. The Professional Staff Survey was designed to determine perceptions of school professional staff regarding the HSCAs role as a liaison between the school and the home and the community. The surveys were sent to those members of the school professional staffs who had referred pupils for inclusion in the HSCA program. A total of 185 Professional Staff Surveys was distributed. Of this number, 127 (68.6%) were returned.

Table 13 contains the percent of staff ratings on items regarding the value of HSCA services. In further analysis the strongly agree and agree categories were combined to determine whether Criterion 3.2 was attained. Analysis of the data indicated that 99.2% of the respondents considered the HSCAs role to be important, and 91.3% of the respondents viewed the HSCA as effective in the role of a liaison between the school, the home, and the community. The services of the HSCA to the total instructional effort of the school was considered valuable by 92.9% of the respondents.

A total of 84.7% of respondents reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance. Members of the professional staff generally agreed that the services of the HSCA helped the pupils adjust to school, home, and community. Positive ratings were given by 85.7% of the respondents for adjustment to school, by 67.3% for adjustment to home, and 64.6% for adjustment to the community. Insights provided by the HSCA were also considered to be helpful toward positive pupil adjustment by 89.4% of the respondents. These percents are based on the number of respondents answering a given item.

Respondents also indicated the frequency to which the HSCA used various activities to help the pupils they had referred to the program (see Table 14). To simplify interpretation the positive categories ("frequently" and "sometimes") were combined. The percent of respondents indicating that these activities took place was 85.6% for home visits, 90.3% for conferences with the staff members who had referred pupils, 94.4% for pupil conferences, 82.1% for pupil conferences in which parents or professional staff were also included, and 79.8% for enlisting help from community agencies. In addition, 51.8% indicated that the HSCA had appeared in court in regard to pupils. These percents are based on the number of respondents answering a given item. The high percentage of respondents that felt the HSCA used pupil conferences as a means of solving a pupil's problem is consistent with the data collected on the Pupil Survey and HSCA Log Sheets.

Table 13

Professional Staff Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the HSCA Project
N=127

Item	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
The Home-School-Community Agent's role as a liaison between home, school, community is important.	127	4.9	90.6	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.8
The Home-School-Community Agent has been effective in providing liaison between home, school, and community.	127	4.6	78.0	13.4	3.1	2.4	3.1
The services of the Home-School-Community Agent to the total instructional effort at your building are valuable.	126	4.6	69.8	23.0	2.4	2.4	2.4
The student(s) you referred to the Home-School-Community Agent showed some improvement.	124	4.2	45.2	39.5	7.3	4.0	4.0
The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustment to the following areas:							
The school	126	4.3	57.1	28.6	7.9	3.2	3.2
The home	113	4.0	38.9	28.3	26.5	2.7	3.5
The community	113	3.9	38.1	26.5	30.1	1.8	3.5
The Home-School-Community Agent provides insights that are helpful toward positive adjustment of disruptive students to school.	123	4.4	66.7	22.8	3.3	3.3	4.1

Note. The rating scale is: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, U = Undecided, D = Disagree, and SD = Strongly Disagree.

Table 14

Actions Taken by the HSCA
As Perceived by the Professional Staff
N=127

Item	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent F (5)	S (4)	U (3)	I (2)	N (1)
Made home visits	118	4.4	62.7	22.9	10.2	2.5	1.7
Held conference(s) with you concerning the student(s)	124	4.4	64.5	25.8	0.0	4.0	5.6
Had conferences with student(s) you referred	124	4.7	83.9	10.5	0.8	1.6	3.2
Arranged student conferences at school which included parents and/or professional staff	123	4.2	51.2	30.9	10.6	4.9	2.4
Enlisted help from community agencies (such as CMACAO, CETA, Health Centers, etc.)	119	4.2	52.1	27.7	14.3	4.2	1.7
Appeared in court in regard to the student(s)	114	3.5	27.2	24.6	27.2	8.8	12.3

Note. The rating scale is: F = Frequently, S = Sometimes, U = Undecided, I = Infrequently, and N = Never

Criterion 3.2, that 80% of the professional staff who referred pupils to the HSCA would perceive the HSCA as promoting understanding and providing assistance to pupils, was attained. Substantially more than 80% of the respondents gave positive responses to all items of the Professional Staff Survey directly related to this criterion (importance of HSCA role, effectiveness of HSCA as home-school-community liaison, importance of HSCA services to total instructional effort of the school, and insights or understandings).

The HSCA Log Sheet provided documentation of HSCA activities. Each HSCA completed the instrument monthly during the period from November 5, 1990 through March 29, 1991, a period of 18.2 school weeks. Table 15 contains the average responses from the instrument and indicates the extent of the various activities in the typical week of a HSCA during the time period sampled.

The HSCAs logged 28 job-related activities in the HSCA Monthly Log Sheet. These activities can be grouped into three roles: guidance, liaison, and school support. Guidance involves direct counseling with pupils individually or in small and large groups. The liaison role involves the HSCA intervening on behalf of the pupil with a third party. This party may be a parent, teacher, administrator, community agency or school psychologist. The last role, school support, involves those activities that support the overall success of the school program. These activities are usually at the request of the building administrator and include such things as telephone calls, lunchroom duty, hall duty, general office work, transporting pupils, and supervising special activities. The average HSCA week included 41.2 sessions involving individual or group guidance for a total of 11.8 hours; 36.0 liaison contacts involving parents, school personnel, and/or community agencies for a total of 10.8 hours; and 10.8 hours involving in various school support activities. An additional 2.4 hours per week was spent in paperwork required in the administration of the HSCA program. The documentation provided in the HSCA Log Sheet along with data from the Pupil Questionnaire (Criterion 3.1) and the Professional Staff Survey (Criterion 3.2) give a clear indication that Objective 3.0 was achieved.

Objective 4.0 required that at least two inservice sessions be provided to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants would rate each session as valuable in providing information that would assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. There were three inservice meetings for HSCAs in the school year. The topics and dates of these meetings were as follows: Teen Pregnancy, followed by Program Orientation for the 1990-91 School Year, October 1, 1990; Occult Worship, November 12, 1990; and Stress Management, December 3, 1990. All three meetings were evaluated by the HSCAs using the General Inservice Evaluation Form, except for the orientation meeting, in which a modified version of this form was used. Both versions of the form are found in Appendix B, pages 43-45. The percent of HSCAs who agreed or strongly agreed that each meeting provided information that would assist them in their duties were as follows, in chronological order: 100.0%, 100.0%, and 85.7%. The percent of positive ratings over all three meetings was 96.1%. Overall ratings from the three inservice meetings are summarized in Table 16. Respondents rated items using a five-point scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1).

Table 15

Weekly Averages of Activities Logged per HSCA on the HSCA Weekly Log Sheets (N=19)

	Average Number of Sessions/ Contacts Per Week	Average Number of Students Per Session	Average Number of Minutes Per Session	Total Hours Per Week
Guidance				
Individual Conferences	28.3	1.0	17.3	8.2
Small Group Conferences	8.8	1.4	12.0	1.8
Large Group Conferences (Classroom Size)	0.6	25.4	41.4	0.4
Job Development and Career Education Instruction	0.6	4.0	38.4	0.4
Miscellaneous Guidance	2.8	8.3	23.2	1.1
			Total Hours Guidance	11.8
Home Liaison				
Parent Conferences (in-school)	3.0		22.7	1.1
Home Visits	5.7		31.7	3.0
Home Telephone Contact	9.3		6.9	1.1
Miscellaneous Home Liaison	1.0		17.7	0.3
			Total Hours Home Liaison	5.5
School Liaison				
Teacher/Staff Conferences	7.6		9.4	1.2
Referrals to School Special Services Staff (Psychologists, Guidance Counselor, etc.)	1.7		14.5	0.4
Follow-Ups to Special Staff	0.9		14.5	0.2
School-Related Meetings	1.0		57.8	1.0
Miscellaneous School Liaison	0.7		22.0	0.3
			Total Hours School Liaison	3.0

(Table continues)

Table 15 (continued)

Weekly Averages of Activities Logged per HSCA on the
HSCA Weekly Log Sheets
(N=19)

	Average Number of Sessions/ Contacts Per Week	Average Number of Students Per Session	Average Number of Minutes Per Session	Total Hours Per Week
Community Liaison				
Referrals to Community Agencies	1.5		18.5	0.5
Follow-Ups of Referrals to Community Agencies	1.2		16.6	0.3
Community-related Meetings	0.5		55.6	0.5
Court Related	0.1		106.8	0.2
Community-related Telephone Contact	0.4		11.6	0.1
Miscellaneous Community Liaison	1.4		31.4	0.8
		Total Hours Community Liaison		2.3
Support Services				
Monitor Halls/Lunchroom/ Grounds/School Vicinity	8.9		29.7	4.4
Telephone (Support Related)	0.5		10.2	0.1
Transport Students	3.8		27.0	1.7
Free Lunch Applications/ School Lunch Program	0.9		7.4	0.1
Teach a Class	0.3		37.4	0.2
Office/Paperwork: Hours (Support Related)				1.4
Miscellaneous Support	9.3		18.6	2.9
		Total Hours School Support		10.8
Program Administration				
Office/Paperwork: Hours (Required for HSCA Program)				2.4

Table 16

Average Responses and Percent of Response
for Reactions to Inservice Statements

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	51	4.4	51.0	45.1	0.0	3.9	0.0
The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	51	4.5	54.9	41.2	3.9	0.0	0.0
There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	51	4.5	62.7	31.4	3.9	2.0	0.0
Questions were answered adequately.	50	4.6	62.0	32.0	6.0	0.0	0.0

Note. The rating scale key is: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, U = Undecided, D = Disagree, and SD = Strongly Disagree.

Additional information was collected on the Inservice Evaluation Form from open-ended questions. Participants were asked to comment about the most and least valuable parts of the meetings, and about information they would like to have covered in future meetings. Only open-ended comments which were made by three or more participants at any single session will be summarized here. However, the evaluation reports on individual sessions have been forwarded to the Department of Pupil Personnel and are available on request.

In regard to the most valuable parts of inservice meetings, the following comments had frequencies of three or more in a meeting: information on teen-oriented programs in the community, information on the HSCA program, the evaluation presentation (orientation), information presented on occult worship, and signs and symbols used in occult worship. In regard to least valuable parts of meetings, only one type of item had a frequency of three or more comments at a meeting: "None," "Nothing," or "Not applicable." There were two suggestions for future meetings with a frequency of three or more: the topic of stress management, and field trips to juvenile facilities (e.g. Buckeye Boys Ranch, Rosemont, etc.).

Summary/Recommendations

The overall goal of the Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) project was to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements that interfered with their success in school. Twenty-one HSCAs served in nine high schools and 12 middle schools. Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils. Each HSCA was asked to randomly select 20 of these pupils for inclusion in the evaluation sample. Thus the evaluation sample consisted of 420 pupils in grades 6-12. Sample size varied with the different evaluation instruments used. Pupil Entry data and Pupil Census data were collected for all 420 pupils, but only 242 pupils had both the pretest and the posttest of the Demos D Scale. The number of pupils participating in the Pupil Questionnaire was 293.

The project had four objectives. The first objective stated that 50% of the selected pupils who are served by the HSCA for the entire treatment period will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. The second objective stated that at least 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements that interfere with their success in school. This objective required identification of those elements which appeared to be obstructing pupil achievement, and evidence of positive adjustment by at least 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample. The third objective, to serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and provide assistance for pupil adjustment to the school environment, required that both 80% of the pupils served and 80% of the professional staff members referring pupils to the program would perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and assistance to pupils for adjustment to the school environment. It also required documentation of weekly activities of the HSCA in carrying out this objective. The fourth objective was to provide at least two inservice sessions to project personnel, such that at least 80% of the participants would rate each session as valuable in providing information that would assist them in their duties.

Objective 1.0 was not attained. Less than the requisite 50% of pupils (46.1%) showed improvement in their attitude as measured by the Total Score of the Demos D Scale (DDS). Average change scores at three grade levels were found to be statistically significant. At grade 9 there was significant improvement in attitude toward teachers and in the total score. Posttest scores were significantly worse than pretest scores in the scale for attitude toward teachers for grade 6, and in the scale for attitude toward school behavior for grade 10.

The primary purpose of the DDS is to determine the probabilities of a pupil dropping out of school. The assumption is made that students who are likely to drop out of school have a poor attitude about teachers and school. The test publisher states that the DDS may be used to identify students with strongly negative attitudes toward teachers and school but cautions that DDS scores be used with all other available information concerning the student. It is not advisable that DDS scores by themselves be used for definitive diagnostic purposes.

The first criterion of Objective 2.0, identification of those elements which appeared to be obstructing pupil achievement, was evaluated on the basis of the Pupil Entry Information Sheet. The instrument provided individual pupil data which could be used by the HSCA, as well as for project evaluation. The four most frequent reasons for referral to the overall project were disruptiveness, teacher conflict, poor attitude, and poor grades. The most frequent referral reason in middle school was disruptiveness, while the number one referral reason in high school was hostility to authority. Over three-fourths (79.0%) of the pupils in the sample were referred for two or more reasons.

The second criterion of Objective 2.0, evidence of pupil adjustment by at least 50% of the pupils sampled, was primarily evaluated on the basis of individual data from the Pupil Census Forms. As rated by the HSCAs, 72.4% of pupils in the evaluation sample showed evidence of improvement in relation to their original referral reasons (54.0% showing "improvement," and 18.3% showing "marked improvement"). HSCAs also gave positive ratings to 65.5% of the pupils regarding academic improvement, and 74.3% of the pupils regarding social adjustment. Further verification of the attainment of this criterion was provided by the Pupil Questionnaire and the Professional Staff Questionnaire. Pupils responding to the Pupil Questionnaire reported that they were getting along better with their teachers (73.4%), families (36.5%), and friends (39.2%) since talking with the HSCA. Of those who responded to the Professional Staff Questionnaire, 84.7% reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance. The data indicated that both criteria for Objective 2.0 were met; thus Objective 2.0 was achieved.

The first criterion of Objective 3.0 was that 80% of the pupils served would perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance for their adjustment to the school environment. Analysis of the Pupil Questionnaire indicated that well over 80% of the pupils perceived the HSCA as promoting understanding, and well over 80% also perceived the HSCA as providing assistance. These data indicate that Criterion 3.1 was achieved. In addition, a majority of the pupils perceived that they had actually improved in each of the following areas: classroom attendance (67.6%), keeping up with assignments (72.0%), and getting along better with teachers (73.4%). A number of pupils also perceived that they were getting along better with their families (36.5%) and friends (39.2%). In regard to specific activities most often performed by the HSCA on behalf of the pupils, 82.6% of the pupils reported HSCA-pupil conferences, 50.5% reported home visits, and 43.0% reported arrangement of conferences with their teachers.

The second criterion of Objective 3.0 was that 80% of the professional staff who referred pupils to the HSCA would perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment. Analysis of the Professional Staff Survey indicated that 99.2% of the respondents viewed the HSCAs role of home-school-community liaison to be important, and 91.3% rated the HSCA as effective in providing the liaison services. Insights or understandings provided by the HSCA were also considered helpful toward positive pupil adjustment by 89.4% of the respondents answering this item. The data from the Professional Staff Survey indicate that this criterion of Objective 3.0 was met.

Objective 3.0 also required documentation of HSCAs weekly activities to meet the goals and needs of the pupils. Analysis of the HSCA Log Sheet indicated that an average HSCA's week included 41.2 sessions involving individual or group guidance for a total of 11.8 hours; 36.0 liaison contacts involving parents, school personnel, and/or community agencies for a total of 10.8 hours; and 10.8 hours served in various school support activities. An additional 2.4 hours per week was spent in paperwork required in the administration of the HSCA program.

Objective 4.0 was to provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants would rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. This objective was attained. Three meetings were provided, which received positive ratings by the following percents of responding HSCAs: 100.0%, 100.0%, and 85.7%. The percent of positive ratings over all three meetings was 96.1%.

The data collected for the 1990-91 Home-School-Community Agent project presented mixed findings. Although the project was considered valuable by pupils, HSCAs, and school staff, improvement of pupil attitudes as measured by the Demos D Scale was less than desired. The project met three of its four objectives. An administrative decision has already been made to continue the project in the 1991-92 school year under the school system's general fund. Under the reorganized program HSCAs will work closely with Safety and Security personnel and the program will be expanded to provide services to more high schools and middle schools. State of Ohio DPPF funds previously used for the HSCA program will be reallocated to other DPPF-funded programs. The following recommendations are made with the recognition that the project will be restructured in the 1991-92 school year:

1. As the role of the HSCA expands, in-depth work with disruptive pupils should continue to be an integral part of the project.

2. The HSCA should be freed from many of the tasks that have traditionally fallen to them at the building level (e.g., lunch room duty, processing free lunch applications, supervising special activities, etc.) in order to provide more time for activities more directly related to project goals.

References

Demos, G.D.(1980). The Demos D (Dropout) Scale. Los Angeles, California: Western Psychological Services.

Appendix A
Dropout Probabilities by Grade

Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	Posttest Dropout Probability Categories: 5	25	50	70	90	Total
5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
50	0 0.0	0 0.0	23 71.9	3 9.4	0 0.0	26 81.3
70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 6.3	1 3.1	3 9.4
90	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 6.3	0 0.0	1 3.1	3 9.4
Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	25 78.1	5 15.6	2 6.3	32 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 2. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Six

Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	Posttest Dropout Probability Categories: 5	25	50	70	90	Total
5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
25	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.0
50	0 0.0	1 2.0	37 74.0	4 8.0	1 2.0	43 86.0
70	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 6.0	2 4.0	0 0.0	5 10.0
90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.0	1 2.0
Total	0 0.0	1 2.0	41 82.0	6 12.0	2 4.0	50 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 3. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Seven

Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	Posttest Dropout Probability Categories: 5	25	50	70	90	Total
5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
25	0 0.0	1 2.2	1 2.2	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 4.4
50	0 0.0	1 2.2	30 66.7	2 4.4	0 0.0	33 73.3
70	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 17.8	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 17.8
90	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.2	1 2.2	0 0.0	2 4.4
Total	0 0.0	2 4.4	40 88.9	3 6.7	0 0.0	45 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 4. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Eight

Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	Posttest Dropout Probability Categories: 5	25	50	70	90	Total
5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
50	0 0.0	1 1.9	27 50.9	4 7.5	1 1.9	33 62.3
70	0 0.0	0 0.0	7 13.2	1 1.9	2 3.8	10 18.9
90	0 0.0	0 0.0	9 17.0	0 0.0	1 1.9	10 18.9
Total	0 0.0	1 1.9	43 81.1	5 9.4	4 7.5	53 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 5. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Nine

Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	Posttest Dropout Probability Categories: 5	25	50	70	90	Total
5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
50	0 0.0	0 0.0	23 69.7	5 15.2	1 3.0	29 87.9
70	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.0	0 0.0	2 6.1	3 9.1
90	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.0
Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	25 75.8	5 15.2	3 9.1	33 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 6. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Ten

Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	Posttest Dropout Probability Categories: 5	25	50	70	90	Total
5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
50	0 0.0	0 0.0	13 76.5	0 0.0	2 11.8	15 88.2
70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.9	0 0.0	1 5.9
90	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.9
Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	14 82.4	1 5.9	2 11.8	17 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 7. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Eleven

EVALSRVCS/P509/RPTFHSC91

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	10 90.9	1 9.1	0 0.0	11 100.0
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	10 90.9	1 9.1	0 0.0	11 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 8. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Twelve

Appendix B
Instruments

Numbers in parenthesis are
for purposes of Data Processing

DPPF
HSCA

PROGRAM (1-5) PUPIL ENTRY INFORMATION SHEET

COST CENTER (6-8)

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER (9-17)

HSCA_____

SCHOOL_____

STUDENT NAME First M.I. Last	STUDENT NUMBER (18-23)	GRADE (24-25)	REFERRAL REASON(S) (39-52)														NAME AND POSITION OF REFERRER	
			Hostile to Auth.	Teacher Conflict	Law-Court Conflict	Class Cutting	Attendance Prob.	Truancy	Family/Home Prob.	Peer Conflict	Poor Grades	Poor Attitude	Drugs/Alcohol	Health Problem	Disruptive	Other(specify)	POSITION	NAME

DPE 9/90

35

49

50

Home-School-Community Agents
Pupil Census Form
1990-91
Program 91053

Directions:

Please answer **all nine** items for the pupil named above, regardless of whether or not you are currently serving this pupil. To do this, simply put a check mark in the blank for the appropriate response for each item.

1. Has this pupil had any involvement with the court in the **current** school year?

   ____ Yes ____ No

2. How many months has this pupil been served by the program (**including** previous years)?

   ____ 1-5 ____ 6-10 ____ 11-15 ____ 16-20 ____ 21-25 ____ 26 or More

3. How many contacts have you had with this pupil in the current school year?

   ____ 0 ____ 1-3 ____ 4-6 ____ 7-10 ____ 11 or More

4. How many in-school conferences have you held regarding this pupil (current school year only)?

   ____ 0 ____ 1-3 ____ 4-6 ____ 7-10 ____ 11 or More

5. How many home visits have you made regarding this pupil (current school year only)?

   ____ 0 ____ 1-3 ____ 4-6 ____ 7-10 ____ 11 or More

6. Did you refer this pupil to a community agency this year?

   ____ Yes ____ No

7. What improvement has this pupil shown academically this year?

   ____ Marked Improvement ____ Improvement ____ No Improvement

8. How would you rate this pupil's progress in social adjustment this year?

   ____ Marked Improvement ____ Improvement ____ No Improvement

9. What was the final outcome in regard to this pupil's original referral reason(s)?

   ____ Marked Improvement ____ Improvement ____ No Improvement

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENT PROGRAM

You have met with _____ the Home School Community Agent in your school, during this school year. The following questions give you a chance to express your feelings about how the Home-School-Community Agent has helped you. This is not a test. You do not have to give your name. When you are finished, fold your completed questionnaire and give it to a secretary in the school office, who will put it in the school mail. Thanks for your help.

Section I

Please circle all responses that apply to each statement.

1. Which of these ways was used by the Home-School-Community Agent to help you?

   A. Visited my home.
   B. Arranged a meeting(s) with my teacher(s).
   C. Took time to discuss my problems with me.
   D. Visited a community agency on my behalf, such as CMACAO, Health Center, or counseling agency.

2. Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with

   A. my teachers
   B. my family
   C. my friends

Section II

Please circle yes or no to each statement.

3.	When a student has trouble in school or with a teacher, it is a good idea to talk it over with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
4.	The Home-School-Community Agent is an understanding person to talk with.	Yes	No
5.	I think I understand my own problems better since talking with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
6.	The Home-School-Community Agent was helpful to me.	Yes	No
7.	I feel my classroom attendance has improved since meeting with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
8.	I am keeping up with my assignments better since working with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
9.	Students with problems can get help from the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No

DES 2/91

HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENT PROJECT
PROFESSIONAL STAFF SURVEY

Questions 1-6. Please circle the number after each statement that indicates your degree of agreement with each statement.

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The Home-School-Community Agent's role as a liaison between home, school, and community is important.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The Home-School-Community Agent has been effective in providing liaison between home, school, and community.	5	4	3	2	1
3. The services of the Home-School-Community Agent to the total instructional effort at your building are valuable.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The student(s) you referred to the Home-School-Community Agent showed some improvement.	5	4	3	2	1
5. The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustments in the following areas (please rate all three areas):					
a. The school	5	4	3	2	1
b. The home	5	4	3	2	1
c. The community	5	4	3	2	1
6. The Home-School-Community Agent provides insights that are helpful toward positive adjustment of disruptive students to school	5	4	3	2	1

Questions 7-12. Please indicate the frequency that the Home-School-Community Agent did each of the following in order to solve the problem(s) of student(s) you referred by circling the appropriate number after each statement.

	Frequently	Sometimes	Undecided	Infrequently	Never
7. Made home visits	5	4	3	2	1
8. Held conference(s) with you concerning the student(s)	5	4	3	2	1
9. Had conferences with student(s) you referred	5	4	3	2	1
10. Arranged student conferences at school which included parents and/or professional staff	5	4	3	2	1
11. Enlisted help from community agencies (such as CMACAO, CETA, Health Centers, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
12. Appeared in court in regard to the student(s)	5	4	3	2	1

DPE 2/91

Columbus Public Schools
DPPF Home-School-Community Agents

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING HSCA LOG

HSCA LOG SHEETS will be completed on a monthly basis instead of on a weekly basis as previously planned. Also we will be using all log sheets (not a random sample) as the data base for the annual report to the state. Therefore it will be necessary to keep track of the number of minutes for all activities on all monthly log sheets.

The HSCA Log Sheet has been revised to better accommodate the increased data requirements. Please note the following changes:

1. The first column now asks for the total number of sessions for the month (not the week).

2. The second column now asks for the total number of students for the month (not the number of students per session).

3. The third column now asks for the total number of minutes for the month (not the number of minutes per session).

4. Although the instrument is now three pages instead of one, the second and third pages simply provide an organized framework for the "Other" category that was formerly at the bottom of the one-page instrument. Use the "Other" category only if you have an activity that does not fit into any of the categories on the first page. These activities should fit into one of the categories for "Other."

Remember that the purpose of this instrument is to document all your HSCA and school related activities, including time spent on each activity. When you add up all the minutes documented for a month, you should find that the total reflects the total time you worked (e.g., a month with 22 work days at 7 hours per day would total 9240 minutes).

DPPF
Home-School-Community Agents
MONTHLY LOG SHEET

MONTHLY LOG SHEET FOR THE MONTH OF _____
Please return to Program Evaluation no later than the 4th of the month following the month logged.

School _____

Name _____

(1-5) Program Code | | | | | |
(6-8) School Code # | | | |
(9-17) Social Security # | | | | | | | | | |

Note: Use the Individual Counseling line when only one student is involved. Two or more students, but less than classroom size, would be considered a Small Group.

	Total Number of Sessions/ Contacts This Month	Total Number of Students This Month	Total Number of Minutes This Month
Guidance, Home/School			
Individual Counseling	_____	_____	_____
Small Group Counseling	_____	_____	_____
Large Group Counseling (Classroom Size)	_____	_____	_____
Parent Conferences (in-school)	_____	NA	_____
Teacher/Staff Conferences	_____	NA	_____
Home/Visits	_____	NA	_____
Referrals to Community Agencies	_____	NA	_____
Follow-Ups of Referrals to Community Agencies	_____	NA	_____
Referrals to School Special Services Staff (Psychologists, Guidance Counselor, etc.)	_____	NA	_____
Follow-Ups to Special Staff Referrals	_____	NA	_____
Job Development and Career Education Instruction	_____	_____	_____

"Other" category: First, check to see if an activity actually belongs in one of the categories above. If it does not, enter the activity under the appropriate general category on the following pages.

	Total Number of Sessions/ Contacts This Month	Total Number of Students This Month	Total Number of Minutes This Month

Description of "Other" Activities

A. Miscellaneous Guidance Activities
(Examples: Helping restore order in a classroom, defusing potential trouble on school grounds, etc.)

_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

B. Home Liaison
(Example: Home telephone contact)

_____	_____	NA	_____
_____	_____	NA	_____
_____	_____	NA	_____

C. School Liaison
(Examples: Staff meeting, inservice or workshop, etc.)

_____	_____	NA	_____
_____	_____	NA	_____
_____	_____	NA	_____

D. Community Liaison
(Examples: Meeting with community groups or agencies, court appearances, community-related telephone contact, etc.)

_____	_____	NA	_____
_____	_____	NA	_____
_____	_____	NA	_____
_____	_____	NA	_____
_____	_____	NA	_____

	Total Number of Sessions/ Contacts This Month	Total Number of Students This Month (if Applicable)	Total Number of Minutes This Month

Description of "Other" Activities

E. School Support Activities
(Those activities which support the overall success of the school program but are not directly related to the HSCA program. Examples include lunchroom duty, hall duty, support-related telephone calls, transporting pupils, supervising special activities, running errands, writing tardy slips, etc.)

_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

F. Office/Paper Work

Related to HSCA Program (Total Minutes) _____

Related to School Support (Total Minutes) _____

Does your "Total Number of Minutes This Month" column reflect all time spent for each activity?

Please return to Program Evaluation no later than the 4th of the month following the month logged.

ESEA CHAPTER 1 AND DPPF
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1990-91 ORIENTATION

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 2 Program:
(1) FDK

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(2) ADK
(3) Reading-Elementary (2-5)
(4) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(7) N or D (1-12)
(8) Non-Public (1-8)
(9) Reading Recovery (1)
(10) Chap.1 Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(11) Instructional Assistant-K
(12) Instructional Assistant-1
(13) DPPF HSCA
(14) DPPF Early Literacy (2)

General Fund Program:
(15) General Fund HSCA

Other (Specify)
(16) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Program Coordinators' Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

****
*
* Please turn over for questions 6-9 *
*
****

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6. Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

7. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

8. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

9. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1990-91

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/____/____ (e.g., 03/05/91)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____ all day _____a.m. _____ p.m.

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 2 Program:
(1) FDK

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(2) ADK
(3) Reading-Elementary (2-5)
(4) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(7) N or D (1-12)
(8) Non-Public (1-8)
(9) Reading Recovery (1)
(10) Chap. 1 Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(11) Instructional Assistant - K
(12) Instructional Assistant - 1
(13) DPPF HSCA
(14) DPPF Early Literacy (2)

General Fund Program:
(15) General Fund HSCA

Other (Specify)
(16) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. Please list any additional information or topics you would like to see covered in future meetings. a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

EVALSRVCS/P509/RPTFHSC91